

Illinois State University ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

3-6-2019

Senate Meeting, March 6, 2019

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, March 6, 2019" (2019). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 1255.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/1255>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, March 6, 2019
Approved

Call to Order

Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

Senate Secretary Martha Horst called the roll and declared a quorum.

Senator Kalter: We're going to start tonight with the Illinois Board of Higher Education Faculty Advisory Council report from Dr. Diane Dean. Is she in the room? Excellent. Come to wherever there is a nice microphone for you.

Illinois Board of Higher Education- Faculty Advisory Council report (Dr. Diane Dean)

Dr. Dean: Thank you for the invitation and the opportunity to speak with you and provide updates from the Illinois Board of Higher Ed Faculty Advisory Council. I want to focus my comments to you on three areas, and they are the IBHE-FAC working groups, other activities and efforts of the IBHE-FAC this year, and just some very brief comments on legislative updates, and I will take those in reverse order. I'd like to preface my presentation to you by saying I regret not having a report to you in advance of the meeting. I had some unusual time demands this semester, but I will have that to you before break begins next week.

Senator Kalter: Diane, before you go on, we did actually send out the one that was there in December, the extensive one, so thank you for that. That must have taken a lot of time.

Dr. Dean: Thank you, the extensive one. But this will just give some written comments to what I'm going to make verbally. So taking those three items in reverse order, regarding legislative updates, there's not been a lot of activity during the recent veto and lame-duck sessions because of the outcome of the 2018 governor's election changes and different committee compositions in the legislature and the new governor's focus on triaging state issues. So higher education has been valued and a focus, but he's been taking them in order of dire needs first. So usually this is the month, in March, when we begin to see attention to higher education so expect to see a lot more activity here going forward. Among the issues that we think are most likely to come back, perhaps with some variations from that extensive report that I gave you last spring, are the Religious Exemption Bill (we think we'll see that again). We think we'll see a continued press for community colleges to be able to offer the baccalaureate in nursing programs, a discussion for more capital funding for repairs and renovations at our institutions, and a focus on creating what we might call a more robust performance funding model.

Regarding the performance funding model, there's never really been a fully-fledged, systematic based funding formula for state universities in Illinois. The IBHE believes we may be the only state without such a base formula, and he has a team together now working on putting together a performance funding initiative for higher education in the state of Illinois, and on that we have one member from the IBHE-FAC and that's our chair. Marie Donovan sits on that committee, and I believe she may be the only faculty member on that 30-member body. The rest of individuals are an array of businesspeople and executives and administrators from colleges and universities around the state. So she represents a lot of people in her one seat on that Board. We've also been paying attention to some recent changes in the Dual Credits Act and also a Senate bill allowing high school teachers to teach dual credit courses without appropriate credentialing as long as they have a three-year plan to attain those credentials while they're teaching the courses. The Illinois Community College Board has been the primary vocal group expressing concerns regarding that, but we have on IBHE as well, and we on the IBHE-FAC are reaching out and have been working with our parallel group of faculty with the Illinois Community College Board on that. So that's all I have to say regarding the legislative update.

Regarding the IBHE-FAC working groups, we've taken a very different approach to our work this year. At the beginning... At last year's Board meeting when IBHE-FAC normally has a chance to present to the Board, we were not well rehearsed for that is a way I would phrase it. We were not well rehearsed for that, and it seems that some of the individuals who had an opportunity to speak may have been speaking more representing their own views or their own institutional concerns than those of representing faculty as a whole, which is the task of our group. So this year we've had work groups. We've divided into five work groups and we've been working on taking positions and thinking of activities and initiatives that we can use to be proactive and have a unified voice on matters that have cropped up repeatedly throughout our meetings over the last recent years. And those five working groups are: This We Believe, the Illinois Articulation Initiative, the Dual Credit/Regional Dual Credit System, P20 Outreach, and Program Prioritization and Consolidation.

And just to give you a brief overview of what those are, This We Believe is sort of an overarching group that is a campaign based on raising awareness of the qualitative and quantitative benefits of higher education to society in Illinois specifically. It's a base working group or base position that supports all four other working groups. The IAI working group was triggered by a statement that was made in that June Board meeting last spring when a caucus member made the statement that IAI is broken, and that elicited quite a number of reactions both in support and disagreement with that. So what we're doing is taking greater consideration, greater time, to consider the evidence on the transfer function in Illinois and to propose solutions to both increase students' awareness of what kinds of courses and credits will transfer and to address issues of transfer credits being accepted by our institutions. The Dual Credit/Regional Dual Credit System work group is focused on concerns for making sure that we have quality classes that are being taught by qualified faculty and addressing what has been an increase in the number of out of state providers who are providing dual credit within our areas. So they are examining data also and seeking to answer questions about the success of students with dual credit coursework when they transfer into four-year institutions, and we're particularly focused on the success of students who have brought in AP credit coursework versus dual credit coursework. The P20 Outreach group is focused on making better connections and synergies between higher ed and our PK-12 community and beyond. And then lastly, the Program Prioritization and Consolidation is focused on looking at/examining the current issues and also the best practices at the institutional level both within the state and then also looking at state-level efforts in other states with regards to program prioritization and consolidation.

On those groups, we've carefully split each of our internal caucus members among each of the three groups so every group has cross representation of Community College Caucus, the Public University Caucus, and the Private and Proprietary Institution Caucus. This year I'm chairing the Public University Caucus, and we made special effort to ensure that we had a number of people on the Program Prioritization and Consolidation work group because we felt like that was one of the most pressing issues to us as a caucus. That is the group that I sit on, but we have representation across all of the working groups and what we've been doing... Our goal is to have some type of product in time for the June Board meeting. So we will have them finish by April, and they're taking different forms. Some groups are preparing white papers, some are preparing presentations that we would make to the Board at that meeting (although we do not yet know whether we will be given time again on their agenda this year), and some are choosing just to create what we can call poster presentations that will be there and available for the Board members to see. We also plan, as I said, on having these done in April not only for presentation in June but for our May meeting which happens in Springfield. We plan to walk the halls again like we did last year and meet with different legislators, introduce ourselves, and get our views known on certain issues that are before them currently in pending bills and legislation.

Let me see if I have anything else. Yes. Just in the last few minutes – I don't want to take too much of your time – but in terms of other activities and efforts of IBHE-FAC, that is what we've been primarily focused on this year, on being proactive rather than reactive to pressing issues around the state, but we have in our meetings

been meeting with various different legislators and administrators to discuss these while they're in development. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. Thank you. Do we have any questions for Dr. Dean?

Senator Pole: Hi. And apologies for the phone. I'm taking notes because my computer died, so I'm not just checking Facebook as you're talking. The Dual Credit Regional Credit system group, sorry...

Dr. Dean: Say more about that?

Senator Pole: Well, right. Could you say a little bit more about that? And actually I was wondering, you said they're researching the AP or is there already kind of an angle that...

Dr. Dean: We're looking into that. So, the data that we would like to have is not available in the usability that we would like to have it, but we're continuing to work on that. Actually, IBHE has done extensive research of their own and they've published some materials with some talking points on that that are available on their website if you'd like to check them out. Our concerns are with the quality of the courses and whether or not qualified faculty are teaching those courses, and because of that we do want to see what are the outcomes of students who have taken those courses versus other kinds of transfer credit pathways.

With regards to the idea of regional dual credit, institutions are given authority to offer dual credit courses within a defined geographic area, so we are thinking about taking a more strategic look at how institutions are offering dual credit throughout the state of Illinois. We do have some areas that could be called a dual credit desert, if you like, that they don't have a local community college provider to assist with that effort, and so in those locations institutions are welcoming in out of state providers who offer online dual credit courses to their students. And one of the things that that does, then, is it creates an incentive for those students to then enroll out of state because they already have credits in university of whatever and it just becomes an easier process for them. That relationship is already established.

Senator Pole: I concur, as a high school teacher. We're having all these conversations at our school right now so I just wanted to see where you were at this point. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful, thank you. Do we have any other questions?

Senator Campbell: So you mentioned that piece of legislation that would allow for high school teachers to educate on a subject as long as they are working towards the educational requirements on that subject. I might have missed this, but does ISU have an official stance on that piece of legislation?

Dr. Dean: Does ISU have an official stance? I don't know. Do we?

President Dietz: Not at this point. This issue came up at the IBHE meeting that happened in Springfield just yesterday, and the group of Presidents and Chancellors are going to take a stand on that and will be a part of all of that.

Senator Campbell: That's good. Thank you.

Senator Kalter: Any other questions? I just have one, and that is could you remind us about the religious exemption issue legislation?

Dr. Dean: Yes, that was one that I wrote about in the spring report. There are faith-based institutions within the state that would like to be able to offer baccalaureate degrees but would like exemption from the different rules and regulations concerning granting them authority to do so. They're claiming that under that they have a religious exemption that they'll be focused on offering credentialing that only has to do with their preparing academic credentials specific for their specific religion, but we are concerned about holding the line on having the same standards for everyone and sometimes once that is bridged it becomes easy to add on, and add on, and add on. It may start there, but we don't believe it would necessarily end there. So that is something that's been fought each time it's come up by community colleges and by the private colleges and universities, and it will just keep coming back. It's one of those issues that just keeps pressing and pressing.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha. Thank you very much. Any other questions?

Senator Kernan: I'm a graduate student academic advisor, and an issue that we recently ran into is that some associate degrees have not been accepted, or students were under the impression that they fulfilled requirements and then last second they received deficiency statements stating that they had additional IAI courses they needed to take. Is that because they don't meet IAI requirements or is it a different requirement that the University holds?

Dr. Dean: That's an interesting question. Without knowing that particular case, I couldn't answer that specifically, but I do know that both things tend to happen, that there are both errors in students not being aware of what credits will transfer, and there are credits that should appear as though they would qualify under the IAI but are not accepted by different institutions. So that is something that this particular working group is looking at in response to our colleague's statement that IAI is broken as a group. As a body, we don't feel IAI is broken, but we acknowledge that there are problems with it, and so that's what we're focused on.

Senator Kalter: I'm going to also pitch that question to Senator Noel-Elkins and Senator Murphy, whichever one wants to field it.

Senator Noel-Elkins: She's pointing to me. The Registrar sent out an email to the advising community on campus about this, clarifying this, just this past week. There is some confusion. The Associate of Applied Science does not count for the full component of general education under IAI; the Associate's of Science, the Associate's of Art do, under the IAI stipulations. And so that's where some of the confusion has come because many – I shouldn't say many – some of the programs where the high schools are offering the opportunity to earn the associates, it's the Associate's of Applied Science, depending on the program, and when that Associate's of Applied Science comes in, it does not cover all of your IAI requirements.

Senator Kalter: Senator Kernan, that was a relatively recent change in how those degrees, what they have in them. It was within the past three or four years. So I think that's probably why it's coming up. Any other questions? All right, thank you very much.

Dr. Dean: Thank you.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Kalter: Chairperson's remarks, there's just a brief one. Because we do have visitors, for some of our Information Items, if there are no objections, I'm going to, once we get past the Administrator Remarks, I'm going to do the Information Items first, then go back to the Advisory Item, and then go to the Action Items just because it seems like the logical thing to do. And so if there are no objections, does anybody have any questions? All right, we'll go to Student Body President Remarks.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Rubio: Good evening, everyone. Just a couple announcements here. Student Government is finishing up our Mental Health Awareness Week tomorrow. Yesterday and today we tabled around campus to promote counselling services, various on and off campus mental health resources, and give away items to help students with daily stress. We were joined yesterday by Dr. Jillian Richardson of Student Counseling Services for a lunch and learn program to learn more about mental health. A memorial walk that was scheduled for tomorrow has been rescheduled to the 28th due to weather and students leaving campus for break. We will finish tabling tomorrow in Milner Library from 12:00 to 4:00, and we look forward to making this an ongoing important conversation among our students. On Wednesday, March 20th, I will be joining some student leaders and members of SGA to head to Springfield for a lobby day. We look forward to working with Dr. Lackland of the President's Office and meeting with legislators to talk about important issues pertaining to our campus community and students throughout Illinois. Upon coming back from Spring Break, Student Government campaigning and elections will kick off. Voting will take place online April 1st-3rd, and we are very excited to see a new set of leaders join the Association for the upcoming academic year. With that, I want to wish everyone a safe, relaxing, and happy Spring Break. I'm very confident that the warm weather will be here before we know it. With that, I will yield for any questions.

Senator Kalter: Do we have questions for the groundhog? That was supposed to provoke laughter all the way around the table. All right, no questions. Then we'll go to Senator Dietz for President's Remarks.

Administrators' Remarks

• President Larry Dietz

Senator Dietz: Thank you very much. I wanted to thank in advance the students for going down to Springfield. The legislators enjoy seeing you, and the messages that you carry are messages only that students can carry to legislators. They expect me to say particular things, but your being there and telling your own stories really help the message. I have been in Springfield quite a bit myself, including yesterday with the Illinois Board of Higher Education meeting at the University of Illinois at Springfield. There is quite a bit of upheaval going on, I would say, as appointments are being made out of the governor's office are frankly, more often than not, appointments not being made but people kind of being held in limbo, and the case is true of the Chair of the Illinois Board of Higher Education. He has indicated that he knows that he will be replaced but there's no timeframe as to when that might happen. There's also an Interim Executive Director of the Illinois Board of Higher Education who is their former Finance and Planning person, and so then there's an Interim Finance and Planning person at IBHE. So we have a bit of a musical chair thing going on within IBHE. Prior to the IBHE meeting, there is always a President and Chancellors' meeting. The early part of that are Presidents and Chancellors and our legislative liaisons, and then later on we bring in representatives from IBHE, the executive director and the chair, to have more conversation. The earlier part of that meeting yesterday with the Presidents and Chancellors was really devoted to the proliferation of bills that are being submitted. I think right now we're tracking somewhere near 67 different bills that have been submitted by different legislators. Part of that is the newness of some legislators wanting to try to honor election campaign commitments. I would say overall that they're trying to do what they think is right. There's lots of different issues. One of the things that I did feel somewhat comforted by is that when Dr. Dean mentioned the community college and the four-year nursing, my understanding is that that bill has been pulled back. And so I think it's going to be lingering out there and community colleges, some of them, still want to offer not only four-year degrees of nursing but four-year degrees in other programs as well. But I think we have been successful in kind of pushing that bill back. Lots of other issues that are going to continue to be bandied about, though.

The IBHE staff has supported the governor's budget, which would increase appropriation operating by 5 percent and have increases in MAP and the AIM HIGH Program. Delighted about that. They also were a part of another hearing that happened that I attended and represented the University on about capital appropriation. I think all of us have confidence that there will be a capital bill. It will be the first time that that's happened in nearly a decade. It's the first time in a decade that there's been a capital appropriation hearing, so those are

always good things. Unfortunately, the capital appropriation hearing quickly got moved into more of a discussion about BEP spend, which is basically expenditures for businesses and vendors that are owned by minority, women, and disabled individuals, and there are a lot of legislators that feel like the institutions are not doing what they need to do in terms of spending in those areas. Well, the fact is that we haven't had a capital bill or capital appropriation, so there's not much to spend. But anyway, we're going to continue to have conversations about all of that. Our request was really overall about \$390 million. That includes money that we have not received yet for the College of Fine Arts plus other expenditures. In addition to that, we also shed light that the University has nearly a half billion dollars in deferred maintenance because there hasn't been state money to help us with much of that. The good news is that over the course of the December holiday and early into this current year, there is a commitment of \$9.6 million, and we added another \$3 million to that, for the College of Fine Arts. So we've got \$12.6 million that we're committing to renovating part of the College of Fine Arts. That's out of what has become a \$61 million project. So it's still a little bit less than half of phase one of that entire project, but at least we're going to get started and it's going to be mainly behind the wall kinds of things. So there's not going to be a lot of things that people will see, but at least we've got some money and we're going to be moving ahead with that.

Also, next Tuesday I will be representing the University at Senate appropriation hearings. Then on the 21st of this month I will appear before the House Appropriations Committee and we'll see how all of that goes. But a lot of time in Springfield and again, thanks to the students for going down and pleading their case about MAP appropriations, capital and other items. Dr. Lackland in my office and the students work well together and really appreciate them doing that.

Lastly, I would like to say that we've also been very busy in the friend-raising and fundraising business. I was in Phoenix and Los Angeles at the beginning of last week attending some alumni receptions, and in Phoenix we had 65 people that showed up at an alumni event, and while we were there we were able to document a million-dollar gift from one of our alums. So things are moving along really quite well there.

Also want to say thank you for all of you who participated in the fundraising week last week and particularly the Birds Give Back day last Thursday. Indeed we had records both in the amount of money that was raised that day, and they're still doing a little totalling, but the last I heard it was about \$625,000 last Thursday. A lot of students I know stepped up and wrote checks. That's very much appreciated, and it all helps. We had a record number of people that wrote checks on that Thursday. We were up nearly \$200,000 in the amount of money that was raised on that Thursday. With that effort, that brings our total fundraising in our campaign up over \$139 million of the \$150 million goal that we have. So things are going along really quite well. Thanks to everybody for participating. We've got more work to do, but I know that we're up to that. So I appreciate that. With that, I'll stop and yield if there are any questions.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. I was just going to make a comment before we go to questions that I think either that \$390 million, or I think it was more the \$1 billion in capital renewal, they changed the formula for how we submit those. So I think it was something like 10% of the capital renewal over a certain number of years. So that's good because it meant that we submitted more. And I also wanted to say thank you to you and Jonathan Lackland for lobbying on our behalf with regard to putting metal detectors, et cetera all over the campus. I actually happened to be at Council for Teacher Education, yesterday I think it was, and he was there talking to them and then I got in my car and he was on the radio talking to the community about how that's going to impact us if that bill goes forward. Do we have any questions for Senator Dietz? All right, seeing none... Going to Senator Murphy for Provost's remarks.

- ***Provost Jan Murphy***

Provost Murphy: Thank you so much. Good evening. Just a couple quick things. First of all, I'm pleased to announce that we've appointed Dr. Jim Wolfinger as the incoming dean to the College of Education. Dr.

Wolfinger is currently the associate dean at DePaul University's College of Education where he oversees budgeting, working with the Chicago area schools, he is in charge of government relations, civic engagement, he directs the college's assessment programs, and coordinates enrollment management. He is a professor of teaching and learning and history. He is a native of Pennsylvania with degrees from Auburn University, the University of Georgia, and Northwestern University. So we're looking forward to having him join us on July 1st. We want to thank Kevin Laudner for his extraordinary work as interim dean of the College. Very pleased that he was willing to fill in for us and wish him well as he heads off in July to Colorado to serve as a dean there. And then thank the search committee. So we had a great search committee, appreciate all of their good work. It's time consuming to be on that kind of a search, but it's one of the most important things that we do, so I really appreciate all of those individuals who served on that search committee. Dr. Paul Garriss was the chair of the search committee, and thank all who participated in the process, everybody who went to open forums and meetings with those candidates. I really appreciate the campus' involvement in this process.

Then would tell you just real quickly a little bit about where we're at with recruiting for fall 2019. So, applications continue to be strong for both undergraduate and graduate students. Admissions continue to be strong for undergraduates. We're just a little bit down for graduates, but that's just processing. That's just the departments because graduate admissions occur at the department level, so just department and schools working through the process of making their decisions about graduate students. We are down a bit on enrollment deposits, so always think about that. You have applications, admissions, and then enrollment. We are down a bit with enrollment deposits, so we have quite a bit of work to do and that's a challenge and we'll continue to keep active in recruiting students to come to this great institution. So those are the only two things. Just enjoy spring break, take some time to relax, and travel safely if you're going somewhere.

Senator Kalter: Great, thank you. Do we have any questions for Senator Murphy? I just have a comment. I wonder whether the changes in taxes – and people are being surprised by getting less of a tax return from their federal taxes – whether that might be having some impact on enrollment deposits, but who knows.

Provost Murphy: Who knows?

- ***Vice President of Student Affairs Levester Johnson***

Senator Johnson: I only have a quick follow-up to our last meeting where Senator Nichols brought up and raised the question regarding influenza vaccinations participation by our students. He and I have had some correspondence since that timeframe, and I hope to come back then at the next meeting with some data to share with you all as it relates to that participation, and hopefully we can see that the numbers have been going up. With that being said, I want to wish the students a great break as well and a safe break and a well-deserved one. Get some rest. Thanks.

Senator Kalter: All right, do we have any questions for Senator Johnson?

Senator Campbell: So I'm under the understanding that Secretary Rejmar, Maya Rejmar discussed with you about the Office of Sustainability and sort of what's been going on there, and she said that you were sort of looking into that, so I was just curious if you had any update on that office moving.

Senator Johnson: Actually that would be Senator Stephens. She did meet with me, and I gave her some directions as it relates to the area that that specific entity reports to and said that Senator Stephens and I would probably have conversations as well about that, but her first stop should be at his office. So he may have more to report on that.

Senator Stephens: Thank you for the question. Actually I had a meeting scheduled to be with her earlier in the week, and unfortunately she ended up falling ill and couldn't make the meeting and so we ended up chatting by

email. And so I've got another meeting rescheduled with her on April 5th, but what I can tell you is we have filled the position of the director role and it is a faculty member from I believe it's the Family and Consumer Sciences, and I believe they'll be leaving their position in that area and will be joining into the Sustainability group sometime I believe in the summer or early fall, but it's a very important priority to us. The last individual who was in the role really did a phenomenal job, and so we were searching for that same type of individual. And when you have that kind of level of success with individuals, you set the bar very high, and we were thankful that we actually found someone that we believe can not only advance from that area but also take this priority even further. So I'll be meeting with her. I'm very excited to meet with her and anxious to see over the next 12 to 24 months how much further we can advance that.

Senator Campbell: Real quick, do you have the name of the person that is... If not, that's all right.

Senator Stephens: If you give me one second. I'll probably mess it up if I don't get the name right.

Senator: Faculty member Elisabeth Reed from FCS has accepted the position and she'll be joining the Sustainability staff in June, I believe it is. And you may recall that she was the person that initiated the Fix It Friday program, which received national recognition and most recently at our Founder's Day, recognition for a Team Achievement Award.

Senator Campbell: Thank you.

- ***Vice President of Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***

Senator Stephens: Thank you, Senator Kalter. Before I get into my brief comments, I actually have some guests with me tonight to cover another very important area, but I did want to apologize. A couple weeks ago I had planned to be here at the Senate meeting and was invited to another event, and unfortunately the event lasted a lot longer than I originally had planned and so I apologize for that. But I do appreciate there were a couple of emails that came through, and one of the particular ones we're addressing tonight. I believe Senator Kernan asked the question of a follow-up from prior meetings where we talked about the issue of snow removal during the winter months and the difficulty that we have given the timeframe that our teams are out there, but the most important priority is to first address those areas that are ADA. They are our biggest priority. So rather than just simply make that particular statement, I worked with these two individuals to my right – Chuck Scott, who is our AVP of Facilities, and Kristie Toohill, which is our Director of Facilities area that had this – and I asked them to put together some general information about our snow removal process throughout the year but most importantly to talk about the exact priority by which in any particular evening that these events occur, that these are the targeted areas that we place our most emphasis on. So if I may, I'm going to pass the mic to them and then let them answer the questions. And this document that you have here is our procedures, and you're welcome to keep it (it is updated every year), but if you don't want to keep it, we'd be happy to take it back because we use it as training materials. So, Chuck, if you don't mind.

Mr. Scott: Thanks, Senator Stephens, Senator Kalter. I know that you'll find it to be riveting reading and you'll want it on your bookshelf, but if you don't care to have that, at the end of the evening we'll pick those back up and we use them for training for our grounds workers. It has been an unusual winter. This year we have seen over 20 snow events, or we will see 20 as of tonight, snow events, and reaching upwards of 35 inches of snow. A typical year for us is about 12 events and 23 inches of snow. So as Senator Rubio mentioned, we'll all be ready for warmer weather soon. I thought I'd go quickly through some of our main procedures on the snow removal processes, but to let you know, we divide our priorities in three general areas. The first level is all ADA sidewalks and ramps, fire lanes, and the Bone Student Center lot, and any other facility that has a major event that's ongoing. So that's always been our highest priority. We've always looked at our snow removal as if there's an individual that has a physical or a visual impairment that is able to get around campus without too much difficulty, then the rest of us that are differently abled will also be able to get around campus equally as

well. So ADA access has always been our highest priority. The second level of priority are building entrances. As we go around the first time, we'll take care of one main entrance to a building, but the second level of priority is to touch all of the building entrances, faculty/staff parking lots and parking decks, and commuter parking lots. And then our third priority are the storage lots for the students because those cars are moved in and out less frequently. And then it's sort of a rinse and repeat type of a process.

So the individuals that are out there removing snow, once they finish their area, they'll go back around and do it again, and do it again, and do it again. We have about 30 people that come onto campus depending on the amount of snow. They usually come at 4 a.m., but if we have 3 inches of snow or more, they'll come at 2 a.m. and they'll go to their designated area. They bid geographic areas and they bid pieces of equipment annually so that they become accustomed to that piece of equipment and that specific geographic boundary. We track, as I mentioned earlier, the snow events – or, excuse me – the types of events that are happening on campus. So we'll track all of the campus calendars to make sure that we know of the main events that are going to have a large number of pedestrians at any particular location. And our goal is to have all of the priorities 1 and 2 completely cleared of snow and treated for ice melting materials before 8 a.m. and then again, storage lots would follow. The following days after the snow has been stopped, we'll go back and we'll be hauling snow off of campus. We'll be removing it with loaders and trucks and the like and hauling it off to some of our remote parking lots for it to melt and for us to be prepared for the next snow. So, Kristie Toohill, she's new in her role as Director of Facilities Management, but she's been on campus for over 20 years and she's going to talk a little bit now about some of the maps that are in the back of the procedure manual.

Ms. Toohill: So if you want to look at our maps, they're in the very back of the guide that we handed out to you and you can kind of get an idea of what our employees do when they come in. So these maps have been established for 20-plus years. We tweak them as we go and as we need to make changes, but you can see in the back it shows different types of equipment that we have. When you look at the map for tractors and Bobcats, Gators, the small equipment, that type of equipment, they're going around and they're focusing on the sidewalks, getting them cleared so you can get from your parking lot to your office or your building, and then they also focus on the ADA ramps. Then another map in there is the large equipment snow route, and those would be the trucks with the plows, and they're going around doing the parking lots and the parking garages to get them clear for when you get there and need to get to where you're going. We also have a map in there for the emergency routes, and that one's in there to kind of show we plow a few streets, not a lot, but just to make sure we have the area cleared and then also make sure the firetrucks and the emergency vehicles can get through if they are needed to. We also keep in contact with Student Access and Accommodation Services and with Office of Equal Opportunity and Access, and we connect with them annually just to look for updates or needs that they may have, but we also connect with them on a regular basis if there are any needs that come up along the way. If we're in the middle of a snow, we might get a call that says, hey, this needs to be plowed for an event that's happening or to get someone into a special place. So we respond to those as well. I think that's everything on the map. Definitely our focus is on the safety of our students, faculty and staff, and guests that are coming to campus.

Senator Kalter: Does anybody have any questions about any of that?

Senator Dawson: One of the concerns that I've had over the years with our building in particular, and that's the State Farm Hall of Business, we've got that lower level atrium and during the heavy snowfalls the snow is packing against those exit doors, which is the only exit readily available in case of fire. I do have some concerns about that. How can we in our building help, if you're stretched thin, to make sure that at least the doors will open? I don't care about the sidewalks, but I want to make sure people could get out if they had to. The doors are packed in with snow.

Ms. Toohill: I'm glad to know that, so thank you for that comment, and we'll make sure we keep an eye on that. We have specific people that will be in that area, or a person, and so we'd make sure that they know. But if we're short we typically have extra help or students that we can make sure hit that area. I don't know that we would ever... Definitely want to be able to get out of the door.

Senator Dawson: If it's a foot of snow we'll help if need be, but I don't know what other areas on campus that might be at a lower level where you have an emergency exit door that would be used.

Mr. Scott: Senator Dawson, we appreciate your offer for help and we are always looking for snow assistants. We'll be calling you at 2 a.m.

Senator Dawson: Oh, Chuck, you know I love it. Okay, I'm sending you an email. Thank you.

Mr. Scott: But no, seriously, we do appreciate your comment. We do have a lot of places – not only are they low in topography – but there's wind circulation that occurs throughout campus and when we have a light snow that doesn't have a lot of moisture to it, it oftentimes will pile up against a doorway. Please feel free to call the Grounds department when you notice that because we have, as I said, upwards of 30 people out on campus and we can be there in very short order. They're dressed for the occasion; they have the equipment that they need. We wouldn't want somebody – even as generous as your offer is – we wouldn't want someone outside doing that work and possibly injuring themselves. But feel free to call the Grounds department at any time. Thank you.

Senator Dawson: Super.

Senator Whitters: I just wanted to know what time does the phone number for the Grounds department end. Because after tutoring one day, it was like 8:00 and it was icy and slipping and falling and stuff, and we didn't know what to do, somebody put table salt down. I don't know if that was the best idea, but I just wanted to know at what time does that phone number not work anymore, if that makes sense.

Ms. Toohill: The grounds crew is typically there from 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 on a regular day, but they're coming in late. But you wouldn't really have access to them. So I would say that you would want to call... We have a phone number that's 438-5656, which is manned all the time. Our work management has it, and then it goes to our heating plant after hours. But in any case you can always call the police and the police department will contact us. They're connected very closely to let us know if something is needed.

Senator Whitters: Thank you.

Senator Smith: Is there any plan to educate the student body or the public in general of how to report a snow removal issue?

Ms. Toohill: That's a good idea. We can do that. I guess it's kind of just been a known thing that people know to call us, but we can do an article or something or a Twitter or do something to kind of help people know how to reach us in a better fashion. We can definitely do that. That's a good idea.

Senator Beer: I was just wondering what kind of communications you have with the Town of Normal and if there's anything you can do about the surrounding apartments. I live over on Willow, and there's been times where it's been super icy and snow is everywhere and I have to take alternate paths, and it just takes a lot longer. And I worry about the students who live in off-campus housing that have accessibility issues and need help with that. I don't know if there's anything...

Mr. Scott: We're in regular contact with the Public Works Department for the Town of Normal, and one of the things that we have concern over is that as large trucks drive through campus on the city streets that they plow shut, with that windrow of snow, plow shut our ramps. So we try to coordinate our efforts together from a timing perspective. It doesn't always work, but we work very closely with them on that. As it relates to off-campus housing, we have responsibility up to and including our boundaries, and I don't know if you realize that all of the city sidewalks that the Grounds department clears is actually property that's owned by the Town of Normal, but we maintain that property. So we're in close coordination with one another. However, we don't have the ability to reach out beyond our borders to students that are living off of campus. We do the best we can with keeping in communication with them, but we don't have that authority.

Senator Lucey: My question relates to parking. It's nice to have all the snow off of the sidewalks, but somehow there are huge mounds of snow that end up in the parking lots in one end. So I'm wondering if there might be alternative ways of storing the snow until it's melted or removed. And then a related question in terms of equipment that you use, my understanding is that there are some locations where they have melt trucks where they put the snow in the truck and it melts and then they let it go through the sewer system. Is there any opportunity to purchase those by the University so that way the snow can be removed more effectively?

Mr. Scott: Good questions. When a person is in a snowplow truck in a large parking lot, they have to push the snow to some location. It's always been in our procedure manual that, and I'll paraphrase, but under no circumstances are any of the ADA parking spaces to be used for storage of snow. But there are spaces in those lots, not ADA spaces but regular parking spaces, where we are not able to pile the snow anywhere but in those spaces. We'll oftentimes consume several spaces in a lot depending upon the amount of snow and the size of the lot. We'll then, when the snow is stopped, we'll haul snow off. We'll pick it up with a backhoe and a dump truck and we'll take it off. I have seen snow melting trucks before in large cities. It's an extremely expensive piece of equipment and I'd have a hard time justifying that kind of expense. Even though we've had, what, 35 inches of snow this year, it's an extremely expensive piece of equipment. So we'll probably just continue to haul the snow off and beg forgiveness for those few spaces that we lose when we have a heavy snow.

Senator Kalter: I couldn't concur more with that reply. We need a Fine Arts building more than we need that truck.

Senator DeGrauwe: This question might be more towards Senator Stephens. I'm not sure your specific role. This is also with parking. We have one parking lot that we know that is still gravel that is not paved, and I've noticed that during the snowing and the time that it is being removed by snow trucks, there are these giant holes to the point where when it melts you can see pretty much Lake Michigan and all the surrounding Great Lakes. I was wondering if there's any way or if there's any plan on getting that last parking lot to be paved over and not to be gravel anymore.

Mr. Scott: I'll answer that. I have seen Lake Michigan, but not Erie, in that particular lot. The lot you're referring to is the only gravel parking lot that we have yet on campus, and it's the one on Main Street across from the football facility on Locust and Main. That's one of our highest priorities for surface lots to resurface, and if we have resources available in the coming year or possibly two years, we hope to be able to get that lot surfaced. One of the reasons in which we have some gravel parking lots, we have had lots in the past for an extended period, is because when a building (or happened to have been a gas station at that particular lot) is removed, it takes time for the soil to settle and we want to make sure that it gets settled and compact enough to accommodate an asphalt or a concrete lot on top. It's been a number of years and it is time to surface that lot, and we hope for it to be our next major lot.

Senator Kalter: I just want to let everybody know it's 8:00 and I don't think Senator Stephens is done with this entire report. I'm not sure, but at least let's try not to be repetitive.

Senator Kernan: It's similar to Senator DeGrauwe's comment, but it's not repetitive. This also goes back to the gravel lot. It's more of a recommendation. I don't know if it would be possible. It's not for the sake of preserving more spots, but would it be possible to shift the snow piles over a bit where instead of you go up and you go that way, you turn back around and come back? Because it's almost become hazardous where you can't see if a car is coming on the other side of the snow pile, and people kind of drive rather crazy in that lot and there's been a few times where I've almost been hit, or when you go around it (I'm assuming it's students; it could be anybody), instead of parking vertically in a spot, they try to park horizontally across the snow pile and then you have cars that are hanging out and either you almost get hit by another car or you almost hit a parked car because you don't see it.

Ms. Toohill: I would say thank you for that comment and we will definitely make sure we look for that in that area and adjust.

Senator Kernan: Thank you.

Senator Smith: I have a couple, so bear with me please. First, this policy is about snow removal. I've only counted two mentions of ice. How does ice play into the policy? Is there a separate one, or what is the University's policy regarding ice?

Mr. Scott: Really, this is all a policy and procedure manual. It's not a policy because policies are heard by this body, but it's a procedure for us. And ice melting and ice control is included in this particular procedure manual. So it may not speak to it specifically in words, but the grounds crew knows what their responsibilities are as it relates. And we get more calls on slipping on ice than we do on snow that needs to be removed, and again, that 5656 number is the one to call when we have issues.

Senator Smith: So my next question kind of goes to the priority list. I noticed in level one that the Redbird Arena lots, when an event is scheduled, is a higher priority than the academic buildings? I could understand this on a Saturday when classes aren't in session, but is there a rationale behind this?

Mr. Scott: It's not the lot because the Redbird Arena doesn't really have a lot per se, but it's the main entrances and it has to do with when there's an event at that facility. Then it becomes one of our highest priorities. But the academic buildings would take a higher priority than Redbird Arena in the event that there was not a sporting event at Redbird.

Senator Smith: So my question then is why would the sporting events take a higher priority than the academic buildings?

Mr. Scott: Oh, it's usually just because of the density of the population – the numbers of people that are there.

Senator Smith: So there's more people at the Redbird Arena than in the academic buildings?

Mr. Scott: It depends on the time of day of the snow. When the snow falls is what's going to dictate a lot of our priorities. Certainly the academic buildings and sidewalks around those buildings are going to be an extremely high priority for us, as is Redbird Arena, as is Bone Student Center, as are any of the facilities that have an event that's ongoing. So we put Redbird Arena there because it's a large facility. It takes a lot of labor, a lot of manpower and equipment to clear snow around it and the large number of steps. So that's why it's on that priority list.

Senator Smith: Okay, and then just my last question is about if, for example, ice removal needs to happen more than once in a given area. So let's say you put salt down in an area and it doesn't melt all of the ice, what is the plan for that?

Mr. Scott: We've been very innovative in the creation of our own salt brine plant, and without getting too technical, essentially what we're doing is treating our rock salt so that rock salt is not only used for traction but also is permitted chemically which is (inaudible) from the Chemistry department that will allow the rock salt to melt ice at lower temperatures. You'll see today, if you look outside this evening, if you look at some of the sidewalks you'll see where it appears that there's been a liquid applied to the surface. That's another chemical that we've put down, a brine that we've put down, that leaves a residue there and it helps for the ice to melt at a lower temperature and it helps us to not have to come back as often. But it's the same process. We'll come back as needed. We'll rinse and repeat and we'll come back and do our areas again.

Senator Smith: Okay, so would there be a reason... For example, on the stairs outside of the Bone right now there's ice on them and there has been for about three days. Is there a reason that things like that fall under the cracks, maybe a hole in the procedures that might explain that?

Mr. Scott: Well, it has to do with weather. We've had warm temperatures and sunshine which will cause the snow to melt and it'll create some moisture, and then at night as it drops to lower temperatures it freezes. So typically in that particular situation there should have been some salt put down, but around this particular building we're not putting salt down because we don't want to void the warranty of the new concrete that's been placed all the way around this building. So sometimes, as you'll notice across the bridge across College Avenue from the second level entrance here to the Bone Student Center, we haven't put any salt down or any brine down this year. You'll notice there's a lot of sand there for traction only, and that's because we don't want to void any warranties. We want to make sure that we preserve the concrete and ensure that we don't have leakage downstairs into the Milner Library as we've had in the past.

Senator Smith: Would it be possible to...

Senator Kalter: Senator Smith, I'm going to start to invoke Robert's Rules of Order to remind you that you've taken up much time. Do you have many more questions?

Senator Smith: No, this is my last question. This is like the number one issue that I get from students, so I think it's the most important one.

Senator Kalter: Thank you.

Senator Smith: Is there any plan to educate students on why salt isn't put down in areas like that? Because I think that a lot of students might take that door that's by the bookstore and walk over that and it would be solid ice and not expect that. So would there be a way to put up signs to let people know that there's ice there or anything like that that might warn them?

Mr. Scott: As Ms. Toohill mentioned earlier, we'll be glad to have an educational communication campaign, if you will, in the future. I think we're getting close to the end of the season. I'm not certain we'll be able to get something implemented right away in the next week or two, but we'll certainly look at that for future.

Senator Smith: All right, thank you.

Mr. Scott: Thank you.

Senator Stephens: If I could add one final comment that it's easy for an outsider like me coming from another state and having to live in a warmer climate and a colder climate. I've lived in climate areas where it never gets above 5-10 degrees. If you have snow that occurs at that particular day, it's not going to melt. The environment by which that Kristie and Chuck and their team, the time of the year that you can expect these scenarios to occur is when the temperature hangs in around 28 to 34. So if you're watching your phone and you're saying today it's going to be a light snow, somewhere around 29, 30, 31, and then you see that snow comes down and then you look at your phone and you see, oh, it's now 15 degrees, there's a real good chance as you walk out that building that that snow that melted when it was 34 degrees, by the time you walked out, it froze. And so we don't have a team that stands literally across the entire campus in order to completely maintain that entire weather pattern. So perhaps our education next year will be the times of the year when you can very much expect this freezing, thawing, freezing and thawing. You wouldn't see that when it's minus 30. It won't happen. That's my general physics. That's about all I know. It can't melt unless it goes above 32 degrees.

Senator Kalter: Senator Stephens, do you have... other than snow removal?

Senator Stephens: No, ma'am. This was it.

Senator Kalter: Because I notice that you have some other staff in the chairs.

Senator Stephens: No, they were here to learn as well, like me.

Senator Kalter: Oh, gotcha. Okay.

Senator Stephens: No, we have everything. Our goal tonight honestly, at the end of the day, was as much of an education but very much the opportunity to have the team understand and get the questions directly. And so we appreciate Chuck but we appreciate your questions and this just helps us for this season and for next season, so thank you very much.

Senator Kalter: All right, thanks very much. And thank you, Chuck, and thank you, Kristie. Let's see. So we are now going to move to our Information Items.

Information Items:

02.20.19.06 Policy 3.2.11 Employment In Excess Of Full Time Appointment Current Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)

02.26.19.02 Policy 3.2.11 Employment in Excess of Full Time Appointment revision MARKUP (Faculty Affairs Committee)

02.26.19.03 Policy 3.2.11 Employment in Excess of Full Time Appointment Clean Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)

Senator Crowley: This first policy is something we've been wrestling with now for the better part of the academic year, and I have two reasons that I'm going to pass the ball over to my colleague, John Baur, and Alice I believe is here from the Counselor's Office. They can answer any questions you might have with much more authority than I, and the other reason is that I left the house this morning without my hearing aid so I probably wouldn't be able to hear any questions you have anyway. So I'm going to turn it over to you and open it up for you to do an introduction and then we can take questions.

Senator Baur: Thank you. So about four or five years ago, the federal government instituted new federal regulations about how grants are managed at institutions. It's called the Uniform Guidance, and the idea was to bring together all of the different agencies' rules about how grants are managed and put them into one uniform policy or regulation that determines how grants are managed. So throughout these past few years we've been trying to get policies more in line with the federal regulations, and one area that we've had a lot of issues with is

in the area of the supplemental compensation. So we've been trying to use the federal regulations to implement our procedures, but the policies that we had in place were somewhat out of date so we needed to update those policies. So about two years ago we got a group together that kind of went through the regulations and went through how we could implement them under our current structure at ISU, and we essentially after a lot of discussion came up with the policy that you see in front of you. If you see, there's a lot of red line because we really had to rewrite the policies to make them up to date and compliant with the regulations. So I'm happy to answer questions about specific parts and defer to Alice about some of the regulatory language if necessary.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. So remember, we're in Information if anybody has any questions, comments, observations about the policy as marked-up, etc. Sometime around quarter to 6:00 I accosted Senator Crowley in his meeting room and I threw at him my technical writing things, and I'm not going to go over them here because it's a waste of everybody's time, but there are a couple of questions, places, where I have substantive questions. Just a few, on the second page of the mark-up, this is in 1.A. underneath the bullet points for the IBS where it says, "IBS includes an individual's regular salary" and then it says, "e.g., academic appointments ranging from 9 to 12 months." Now, that seems like an editorial thing, but I'm wondering if we mean to have an e.g. for (f-o-r) academic appointments. In other words, the IBS includes an individual's regular salary, for example, for academic appointments that range there. And you don't have to answer that question. I'm just wondering if that's a more accurate way to put that. But then down a little bit further in that same sentence after it says Policy 3.1.4 – Acting/Interim Compensation, when we added the new sentence to the very top of the preamble, we added also "without prior approval under Policy 3.1.4 or this policy," and I just wanted to point out there that we might want to put an "or this policy" at the end of that sentence if you're seeing what I'm saying there. So this sentence that we're on says, "IBS includes an individual's regular salary and any acting/interim compensation approved pursuant to Policy 3.1.4." I guess for that sentence maybe that's not necessary because it says it's specific to acting/interim compensation, right?

And then the next one that I wondered about was in the buyout where it says, "A buyout is defined as replacement of an employee's salary by alternate funding sources to perform work on a specific project. Buyouts are only arranged for duties up to 100% FTE, not for duties beyond 100% or for extra service compensation." I'm wondering if that's a distinction without a difference. In other words, the "not for duties beyond 100%," is that really otherwise known as extra service compensation? And if it's not, is there a way that we could have an example there so that we see where there is a difference? I'm not sure if you're... It's hard to follow on both the mark-up and the other one.

Senator Baur: My sense is that that was not for duties beyond 100% or, in other words, extra service compensation.

Senator Kalter: So it is an "in other words."

Senator Baur: That's the way I would interpret that, yeah. I think that's the intent.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So just as sort of a friendly suggestion to sort of change that from an "or" to an "in other words" or an "otherwise known as" or something like that. I think I only had two more. On the third page of the mark-up, it's where we're defining extra service compensation includes but is not limited to, and just so that we're all clear, it's the 4th bullet point down. "Projects or assignments (not covered in Policy 3.1.4 – Acting/Interim Compensation) in excess of regular scope of employment having a duration of less than 50% of the contract period..." I was wondering if Alice or maybe you, John, could explain what that means exactly. It's a little bit confusing. In other words, is that saying if I'm on a nine-month per year contract that it would be for a project or assignment that's four and a half months or less? Is that what that's meaning?

Ms. Maginnis: Yeah, and the reason that was added is because the committee felt like they needed to make a distinction between the kinds of appointments that needed to be a temporary or an interim appointment under Policy 3.1.4 and work that could be covered under this policy because otherwise we could just have a project or assignment that would be under the supplemental compensation without a time limitation. So they wanted more guidance. So that's where that time period came from.

Senator Kalter: Okay. So the way I was understanding it was correct.

Ms. Maginnis: Correct.

Senator Kalter: Okay, terrific. And then I think the only other one that I had that's not an editorial thing is in the next set of bullet points about extra service compensation does not include and it's way, way down. It's the one where it says... There are two of them, actually. One of them has to do with non-tenure-track faculty, and the other one has to do with Faculty Associates working in the lab schools. So I want to do that second one first. I wondered, first of all, do we mean there payments to Faculty Associates working in the lab schools that might be above 100% of their IBS, or do we mean any compensation to Faculty Associates? And if we mean the second one, wouldn't it be easier to just define them out of the policy right at the top of the policy?

Ms. Maginnis: I mean, we can exempt them at the top, it's just that when we were putting together the list of things that this does not include, this is where they were gathered. So if it's easier to put a separate exemption that could be drafted.

Senator Kalter: So that is what you meant, then. The second one was just that the policy doesn't at all apply to Faculty Associates.

Ms. Maginnis: Correct, just because of the nature of the work and the contract period is so different from kind of the standard university appointment, the committee felt that it wouldn't be appropriate to apply it.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha, great. Okay, and then the one above it about the non-tenure-track faculty members, I'm confused about that one for a similar reason because they are actually specifically defined into the policy right at the top, and then it says, "payments made to them above the 100% FTE status as defined by the collective bargaining agreement." So I wasn't quite sure why they're first defined in and then seem to be defined back out.

Ms. Maginnis: And so we did that because of the ongoing bargaining relationship and the fact that the collective bargaining agreement changes over time. So where there are negotiations that impact over awards or additional pay that could apply to NTTs, the collecting bargaining agreement should trump this particular policy.

Senator Kalter: Oh, okay. So there is a distinction being made between certain kinds of over 100% status and those that are defined within the collective bargaining agreement.

Ms. Maginnis: Basically where it's negotiated under the collective bargaining agreement, that controls.

Senator Kalter: Okay, but there could be other instances that are something else?

Ms. Maginnis: Theoretically.

Senator Kalter: Theoretically, okay. Gotcha. I think those were all of my substantive questions. Does anybody else have any now that you've heard all of mine?

Senator Blum: I have a more generic question. The 25% rule, how many faculty are going to be impacted by that change, and are we kind of working with them about that change and are they aware of that change? That's sort of the question there.

Senator Baur: So yeah, as part of this we did look at that, how many people would be affected by it, and we have been trying to work with those people informally as we have gone through this process and realized that we need to comply with the federal regulations. The last time we did an analysis was about two years ago, but there were about 12 to 15 individuals that would be affected by this, and I believe we got most of those situations resolved in advance. But it still could affect a few people and we've been trying to get the message out about how this will be affecting those people.

Senator Kalter: Anybody else? All right, if not, with technical writing types of things and those other things that I've mentioned, we'll probably see that one after spring break. We'll move to same from Senator Crowley and his committee, the Administrative Increment Policy, 3.1.4 (the celebrated 3.1.4).

02.20.19.03 Policy 3.1.4 Administrative Increment- Current Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)

02.20.19.01 Policy 3.1.4 revision proposal MARKUP (Faculty Affairs Committee)

02.20.19.02 Policy 3.1.4 revision proposal Clean copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)

Senator Crowley: Both of these policies were drafted by an ad hoc committee on which both Alice and John served, and so once again I will defer to their expertise.

Senator Baur: I have to admit I didn't study up on this one as much as I should have, but this went hand-in-hand with the other policy so that in the case of certain faculty or staff who really have perhaps a grant or an administrative role that's perhaps grant funded or funded in another way if they really are exceeding the duties that are assigned to a faculty member. So, I have a million-dollar grant and I'm running the institute for whatever and it goes beyond what my faculty assignment is, this allows us to actually provide a separate appointment that allows for that in compliance with the regulations. It's a duty that's outside and beyond the regular faculty duty, and the regulations allow us to define when something exceeds the duties typically assigned to a faculty member. Alice wants to add.

Ms. Maginnis: I guess I would just say the federal regulations are all about an individual's base salary and what is in excess of a base salary and what are duties kind of beyond the scope of a faculty or anybody's role at the University. So by adopting a definition that establishes a base salary for an individual, we basically wanted to create the companion mechanism that allowed when folks are truly taking on duties beyond the expectations of their role that we had a means under our policy to allow compensation for that. So that was the main reason for the change.

Senator Kalter: All right, do we have any questions, comments, or observations about the changes to that one? Other than some really tiny sort of technical things again, I have just one friendly suggestion. In the second paragraph where it says, "Appointments of faculty to administrative positions not having the term acting or interim are to be made in accordance with the other policy," I wanted to suggest that we might also wish to reference the Chairs Policy, the Deans Policy, and the Administrator Selection Policy because all of those in some way or another are... They're sort of the most likely places where we have acting/interim types of positions. Anybody else have anything for that one? All right, we will also see that one back and we'll couple them together and make sure that they don't lose each other. They've been in a nice dance over the last several months. All right, thank you very much and thank you, Alice.

01.03.19.04 Policy 3.2.13 Administrator Selection and Search Policies CURRENT COPY (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

02.26.19.05 Policy 3.2.13 Administrator Selection and Search Policies Mark Up (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

02.26.19.04 Policy 3.2.13 Administrator Selection and Search Policy Clean Copy (Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

Senator Marx: Thank you. This policy is somewhat complex, and I'm going to make remarks about the substantive changes that have been made using the mark-up copy. So if you'll follow along with the mark-up. First of all, because it's so complex we've put back in the section labeling to enable us to identify specific sections more readily. The formatting throughout has been made consistent and things like font sizes and different fonts that were present in the old one have all been corrected. So those are some minor changes, and there were dozens and dozens of those kind of things. The substantive changes – I'll begin with Section I.B. which actually defines what we mean by an acting or interim administrator, and those definitions were made in consultation with HR. In the next section, in I.C, the concept of an open search versus an internal search has been defined. Rather than calling it an external search, we want to make sure that it's understood that an open search includes both external and internal candidates and that these two types of searches are the preferred mechanism. You know, this policy deals with predominantly higher level administrators, and we believe the preference should be for either an open or an internal search in these cases. The policy does allow for a targeted search in which an individual is identified and would be appointed as it was in the original policy before we've redefined the targeted search, and that's been moved down to Section F and I'll come back to that in a little bit.

All right, moving down to Section I.E.2, the committee, as with other search committees, will receive official search training from Human Resources where before it said that the committee would consult with representatives, and that's not what happens. They receive formal training. Moving down to 4 of that same section, this has to do with when the appointing officer and search committee have agreed that there are no additional candidates. The last part of that has been crossed out, and that should not have been crossed out. It says that "the committee shall communicate fully to the appointing officer the reactions of campus constituencies to each of the candidates that it recommends." That should not be crossed out. It's just a mistake in the mark-up.

Now for the targeted searches, and the primary thing that led to the AABC reviewing this policy once again was to create some guidelines for the targeted searches. What we wanted to do was to make sure that there is a shared governance component in the interest of both shared governance and diversity and inclusion to make sure that if one was going to have a single candidate appointed that there would be an opportunity for some kind of commentary to be made. So the solution to this was that the President would be one to name a nominee for the position, and then that nominee would hold a public forum or meetings with the appropriate constituencies so there would be opportunity for questions and so forth, and then there would be some opportunity for comments to be made and received by the President. Now, this does place a burden on the nominee. We're aware of that, but we think that in the case of these high-level positions the majority of the campus community is affected by these and there ought to be an opportunity for some input in that process before the final appointment is completed. So that's the entire thought process for that section.

Moving on to Section G.4. The existing policy allowed a committee member to resign and then become a candidate for the position, and we didn't feel that that would be a fair thing in the process, so therefore we've put it in that once a person has agreed to be on the search committee, they cannot become a candidate for that position. Now, if the committee is dissolved and a new search has begun, then that person could become a candidate in that event.

All right, moving down to H.2. Let's see. This is about the searches for department chairs. In the existing policy for the appointment of deans, it's the Provost that appoints deans. And in the existing policy that we have before us, the department chairs and school directors would be appointed by the President. For

consistency with the Dean Policy we've switched that, that it becomes the Provost that makes the appointment of chairs and directors.

All right, moving down to Section 3 in the same... So it would be H.3. The beginning of that is crossed out where it says "in all other cases covered by this policy." That should not be crossed out. And then at the end (near the end) it says, "The President or the President's designee shall in executive session inform the search committee." We'll end that with a period there. And then the next sentence would be "The Academic Senate or other appropriate groups (College Council, coordinating team, or Graduate Council), shall be informed of the name of the person hired when appropriate to do so" is the way that should read.

All right, now moving on to Section II, the Search Committee Composition. The intent at the top of this in the existing policy was that for the seats on these search committees that are designated for tenured or tenure-track faculty, that those seats would be occupied by what are considered tenured/tenure-track faculty and would not include various administrators. There are, of course, positions on these committees for administrators and department chairs and so forth. So we simply reworded what was already there to make it a little bit clearer and hopefully have succeeded in that. II. B, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, was moved up. That position is considered perhaps a little bit more important. I'm not sure if our other Vice Presidents would agree, but anyway, we've moved it up so it becomes the first one in the list here of the search committees.

Other than that, I think that about covers the substantive changes. So, I welcome any questions at this point.

Senator Noel-Elkins: It looks like, and I can't tell totally from the mark-up, that for the Director of the Graduate School there are also some changes – expanding the pool of AP and civil service folks who could be considered for that position. But in talking with Senator Roberts, it seems to us that this is the only one of the search committee compositions that says an AP or a civil service person. All of the other search committee compositions have an AP and a civil service person. And so I think we would offer that it should be consistent with other search committees, especially since it looks like the pool of potential people who can serve has been expanded.

Senator Marx: Okay, that is something I'd have to go back and check on. I don't believe our intent was to make any changes to that particular part of the policy because this body had approved that particular change in the policy about a year ago. So our intent was not to make any significant changes there. So I'd have to take a look at that.

Senator Noel-Elkins: But it looks like there is a change. The current says "administrative professional or civil service employee from the graduate school or who supports..." And maybe there isn't a change. Again, this is hard to look at with the mark-up. But again, we would offer it's the only one where only an AP or civil service can serve.

Senator Kalter: I think, Senator Noel-Elkins, where you're thinking that there is a change, what they did was to move the sentence from the bottom into the middle to contract administrative professional into AP and CS, but they both do say that it's either an employee from the graduate school or who supports a graduate program on campus and then added from a list of three names and where it's provided from. So I think that it was just trying to improve what was already there but not changing it substantively. Is that right?

Senator Marx: That's correct.

Senator Baur: I was going to say from history, when we did the search in the past, we wanted to make sure there was a representative from a graduate program or the graduate school, and I think at the time there was not enough AP and civil service within the graduate school itself to really have both. But if you expand the pool

from what you can pull from, it's not just the graduate school, then it's fine to have one of each as far as I'm concerned.

Senator Kalter: I would just caution us there that when we had this discussion we wanted to make sure that there was a majority faculty because this is a position that is very impactful on faculty and that increasing that number because of where the students are right now – so we've got three students – just to make sure that we don't go below a 50% plus one for the faculty on that committee. Because the main people who are going to be impacted by this are students and faculty. Do we have any other observations about the proposed changes? I just had a couple of mine, and you already know some of these, or all of these I think, Senator Marx. Let me just go back. You answered the first question about how that sentence in E.4 had accidentally been erased, and so that's coming back in. In F where it says, "In most cases, preference should be given to open search," it probably should say "an open search," I think. "In most cases, preference should be given to an open search or an internal search. However, there may be instances where the President has identified an individual that is particularly well suited..." etc. Where I was confused there is why we don't say "appointing officer" rather than "President" because some of the searches defined by this policy are, for example, searched by deans or by Dr. Baur, etc. I was wondering if you could comment on whether that would be a friendly amendment or not.

Senator Marx: Yes, as I mentioned earlier, this particular part of the policy should be used at the discretion of the President under the guidelines that are within this policy. And in talking with you earlier, I think that we could make it President or President's designee, but we would like to ensure that the President is involved in the consideration of having a targeted search and gives approval to it.

Senator Kalter: In other words, the way you described this to me before the meeting was it was actually your intention to confine that to the President because of the feeling that very much an open or internal search should be the much greater preference and not to make it easy to do a targeted search, for example, for a chairperson or for a dean or what have you.

Senator Marx: That's correct.

Senator Kalter: And I wondered also if Dr. Dietz would like to comment on that change to the targeted search since we are putting the responsibility, if we keep it that way, into the President's hands. Do you have any comments that you wanted to make about any of that paragraph there?

President Dietz: Well, first of all I obviously support the idea of shared governance and have tried to conduct myself in that way where people have an opportunity to get their oar in the water on these kinds of things. My only concern, I guess, is that if candidates are asked to be nominated, my sense is that – and I think this happens so rarely is part of the deal – but we may be missing out on some terrific people who frankly don't want to go through that scrutiny. The other part of the argument is that if you don't want to go through the scrutiny, then perhaps they ought not to have the position. I understand that, but I do think there are times when some good candidates would just say I don't want to do that, and I think the institution could be missing out on some talent. But having said that, I think shared governance is obviously the thing that in my estimation we not only talk about here but we live that, and so that would be I think my only comment about that. Because I do think for the most part we do open searches and one of the big changes that we've had is in the use of search firms. We've really not been using search firms very much because of cost factors and we think that we have a pretty good team inside to do those searches. So I think the overall philosophy that we've followed is that we have open searches, so it's pretty rare that we even go here and to me it would be even more rare that we would use this targeted search policy, period. I do think that this restricts us a little bit in terms of perhaps not getting some really terrific candidates because they just don't feel a need to go through that. They think that might jeopardize their status within their department or their academic unit or administrative unit.

Senator Kalter: Does anybody else want to weigh in on any of that part of it, targeted searches? All right, and I will point out, by the way, as we're thinking about it for next time that one of the requirements there is that the nominee would hold either a public forum or meetings with appropriate constituencies so it looks like the committee was trying to make sure that it's not just always open to all of campus but to sort of tailor it to whatever the search is or what the circumstances are.

Senator Marx: That is correct.

Senator Kalter: And that that would be, it looks like, at the discretion of the President, which one it is?

Senator Marx: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Okay, and then my only other thing was just – you had already gone over this – but I want to make sure that we're clear going into the Action Item. For H.3 where you had said that the sentence that begins, "In all other cases covered by this policy" that you want that full sentence reinstated. In other words, it said, "In all other cases covered by this policy, after receiving a satisfactory report from the committee, the appointing officer shall indicate to the President his or her preference." We can change that to gender neutral, but it looks like we also might need to change President because it's not always going to be... Or is it always going to be the President? Perhaps not.

Senator Marx: Okay. Let's see. Yes, the two cases – the dean and department chair/school director, those cases – the appointing officer is the Provost. For the other positions, am I correct that it is the President for these others?

Senator Kalter: So, for example, AVP is in the Provost's office or certainly for the Vice Presidents it is.

Senator Marx: Yes. Graduate school director... I'm trying to remember.

Senator Kalter: I believe usually its two levels up. So it's both the supervisor and the supervisor's supervisor. I'm just trying to think if there are any places where that would not be... You know, now that we've ruled out the departments chairs and school directors, is there anywhere where that... I mean, one place would potentially be the graduate school director because that would be the AVP for Research and Graduate Studies and then the Provost. So we might want to change that wording very slightly, but otherwise we want that whole sentence back in?

Senator Marx: Yes. I believe so.

Senator Kalter: We'll keep scrutinizing it just to make sure. Just to dot the T there. Does anybody else have anything on that policy?

President Dietz: If I might add one comment, and Senator Marx and I have talked about this, it could be that some of this language is an artifact of the idea that the President really is the Chief Executive Officer and approves promotion and tenure and all kinds of things that I'm not directly involved with in terms of the department head or the department recommending promotion and tenure, those kinds of things. So ultimately the Board of Trustees hires one person, and that's the President, and they delegate everything else to the President that happens in the institution in terms of personnel issues. So it could be that some of this language is reflecting that overall sentiment. It doesn't mean that we can't improve on that.

Senator Kalter: Yes indeed. All right, let's move then. We have an Advisory Item and we have two Action Items. It is ten to 9:00. I'm going to ask the Provost for the Advisory Item. For the Advisory Item, Senator

Murphy, we have this policy for online classes during weather closure. It seems as though that's going to be potentially a long information-gathering conversation. Should we move that to the next agenda?

Policy for online classes during a weather closure (Provost Murphy)

Provost Murphy: Yeah, you know, this is what happens when I am out of town and I miss Executive Committee, and I looked at that agenda and I was getting ready for tonight. I don't think there is a policy.

Senator Kalter: Right. We talked about this in our one-on-one that you wanted us to give you feedback about whether there should be a policy, and if so, what should be considered in it.

Provost Murphy: Or at least how to have that conversation, and I think that needs to be a faculty- and student-driven conversation, so I'd really look to your advice on how to have that conversation. We're looking for advice.

Senator Kalter: I'm just thinking that given that we've had sort of a lot of discussions tonight that maybe we want to just put that one over to the next meeting because it might take a while.

Provost Murphy: Absolutely. We're done with cold weather for the year. I think this is it. So I think we're good.

Senator Kalter: So we can do that at any time. All right, so let's move on to our action items.

Action Items:

09.27.18.04 Policy 5.1.8 Skateboarding Activities (From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

02.21.19.15 Policy 5.1.8 Skateboarding Activities Mark up (From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

02.21.19.16 Policy 5.1.8 Skateboarding Activities Clean Copy (From Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee)

Senator Marx: Last time there were two questions from the floor. There was the addition that the skateboarding is not motorized, and we agreed to that. The second was the question about the University's liability. We checked with Legal and Risk Management. Both indicated that they have no issues with the policy as it is, that the liability is as with any other activity on campus.

Motion by Senator Marx on behalf of the Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee to approve the changes to Policy 5.1.8 Skateboarding Activities. The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right, we have a new updated skateboarding policy. Thank you very much.

09.18.15.08 Policy 7.7.6 Registration Blocks Current Copy (From Academic Affairs Committee)

02.21.19.13 Policy 7.7.6 Registration Blocks Mark up (From Academic Affairs Committee)

02.21.19.14 Policy 7.7.6 Registration Blocks Clean Copy (From Academic Affairs Committee)

Senator Pancrazio: The last time this came up as an Information Item. There were two questions from the floor. One was to double check all of the names and contact information. You'll see in the new mark-up that there is an updated... Student Code and Conduct is now Student Conflict Resolution, and there is an additional telephone number for medical records, which is one of the items that typically comes up for holds. The second item, there was a question from a Senator about having email as one of the means in which to contact students to let them know they have holds. I spoke with the Registrar and he said that currently the software for the management system does not allow that. However, he took note. So we did follow up on that. At this point, if there are no other questions, we'd like to go ahead and put this on the floor for your approval.

Motion by Senator Pancrazio on behalf of the Academic Affairs Committee to approve the changes to Policy 7.7.6 Registration Blocks.

Senator Kalter: All right, being put on the floor on behalf of the committee. Do we have debate about this one? I have a tiny little friendly amendment, Senator Pancrazio. In the second paragraph, I believe it's the third sentence, it says, "The description should state if it is blocking them from registering and a contact office," and I would put the word "include." In other words, it would say, "The description should state if it is blocking them from registering and include a contact office with phone number."

Senator Pancrazio: Accepted.

The motion was unanimously approved.

Senator Kalter: All right, and I just want to say one other thing about this policy. I have a note to myself. I think this might be from the last meeting. Is there a place online where all possible holds are listed – that might have come up in the last conversation – and that maybe at some point we want to link this policy to that place where they're all listed.

Senator Pancrazio: It did come up in the previous conversation and it was between you and Senator Marx, and I believe that the sentiments that came out of the Exec was not to list a lengthy list of explanations because those can change over the years.

Senator Kalter: Yes, not in the policy itself but to make sure that the students knew where to go look for the types of holds that could happen and to understand them. Does anybody remember that?

Senator Pancrazio: There is not a definitive list; however, the holds are set up as an as-needed basis, and they provide the information directly in the holds. For example, if I have a vaccination... Because I'm a faculty member, if I take a class, I need to have the same vaccinations as students. It will give me the contact information for medical records right in that hold.

Senator Kalter: Gotcha, okay. All right, so let's see. We are now on to our committee reports. Let's go quickly through those. Senator Pancrazio for Academic Affairs, what did you do tonight?

Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Pancrazio

Senator Pancrazio: Sat around and talked. Academic Affairs did not have a quorum, so we had a wonderful discussion, lots of information, but it was unofficial. I want to thank those that came.

Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Marx

Senator Marx: AABC did have quorum tonight, and we worked on the commentary on the President. We continued looking at that.

Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Crowley

Senator Crowley: We initiated our discussion of the Sabbatical Leave Policy, and we'll continue the read-through on that in the next meeting and we anticipate having an information item shortly for you. Our goal is to have everything wrapped up before the end of the semester.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. It says Senator Mainieri, but it's really Senator Ferrence. What did we do tonight?

Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Ferrence

Senator Ferrence: Well, to preempt a potential lack of quorum, we simply chose not to meet tonight, so I have nothing to report.

Senator Kalter: And I must say that it's awesome that so many of us still showed up to this meeting, right? So this is very good. And Senator Horst is not here; she had to leave early. For Rules Committee, Senator Blum, do you want to give the report?

Rules Committee: Senator Horst

Senator Blum: Yes, tonight we made some minor changes in the Code of Ethics, voted on those, and will send them to Exec. And now Amorous Relations Policy, the former Consensual Relations Policy, which had been out of Rules and went to Exec and then went through the University and then came back to Rules and went through a lot of revisions through that, was now again passed and sent back to Exec and so that will be going forward. And there are some minor changes that we'll be working on in the next day or so related to the CTE bylaws that should be coming forward soon.

Communications

Senator Kalter: Excellent. Do we have any questions for any of our committee chairs at all? Do we have any communications for the Senate other than have a great spring break? All right, no communications. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

Adjournment

Motion by Senator Smith, seconded by Senator Whitters, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.